

*By
conceded*

such that said reflective finish reflects light from said tubular light source towards the lens portion.

A, 10 and F1

17. (Amended) The invention of claim 15 wherein the plurality of facets are arranged in a stepwise orientation.

REMARKS

1. Title

In the Office Action mailed May 3, 2001, the Examiner objected to the title of the invention. The basis for objection was that the title was not descriptive. Accordingly, Applicants propose a new title more indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

2. Figures

In the Office Action, the Examiner also objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR §§ 1.84(p)(4), (p)(5). The Examiner stated that reference characters designated more than one element in the drawings, reference signs were mentioned in the description but not illustrated in the drawings, and references signs were illustrated in the drawings, but not mentioned in the drawings. In response, Applicants enclose herewith a Request for Approval of Drawing Corrections together with revised copy of Figures 1, 3, and 4.

The revised Figures 1, 3, and 4 add and/or remove reference numerals associated with elements in the Figures. Specifically, revised Figure 1 clarifies that reference number R2 (interpreted by the Examiner as 22) identifies the point of incidence of ray

16'. Revised Figure 3 removes reference numbers 86, 88, 90, 100, and 102 which are not mentioned in the description and adds reference number 73 (P5) to uniquely identify the source. Revised Figure 4 adds reference number 160 to identify the reflective surface and removes reference to 138, 139, 144 and "i" that are not mentioned in the description. Applicants submit that reference "a" in Figure 4 is referred to in the description on page 18, lines 3-4 and reference 104 is referred to on page 11, line 1.

As Figure 2 refers to the reflector aperture as reference character 56, Applicants propose to amend the specification to reference the reflector aperture as 56. Figure 2 need not be amended to include reference character 64. As such, Applicants have overcome the Examiner's objection by amendment to Figures 1, 3, and 4.

3. Claims

Applicants cancel claims 9, 12, 13, and 16. In light of Applicants' cancellation, the Examiner's rejection of these claims are now moot.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter to which Applicants regard as the invention.

In response, Applicant has amended the pending claims to more particularly claim novel aspects of the present invention. Specifically, Applicants have removed indefiniteness associated with the positioning of the light source in claim 1, the surface of the reflector surface in claim 4, and the arrangement of the plurality of facets in claim 17.

As such, Applicants submit that the presently pending claims overcome the Examiner's rejection on § 112, paragraph 2, grounds.

Claim rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 and 13-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lieszkovszky et. al. (US Pat. No. 6,168,293 B1). Applicants have carefully reviewed the prior art reference and have amended the pending claims so as to overcome the Examiner's rejection.

The presently claimed invention is directed to a tubular reflector having a semi-circular or elliptical reflective surface. The reflective surface is positioned around the tubular light source so that light is reflected off the reflector and toward the aperture of the tubular reflector. The reflector may have a height equivalent to the diameter of the light source and may have a smooth or multi-faceted surface so that the redirected light achieves a desired pattern.

In stark contrast, Lieszkovszky discloses a reflector lamp for a rotationally symmetric lamp. The reflector lamp has a forward parabolic section and a rear ellipsoid, spherical, or parabolic section. The light source is aligned with the axis of the reflector and is centered at the focal point of the forward and rear sections. The parabolic section is fluted to smoothly spread reflected light. The rear concave section is not fluted so as to direct light within a desired beam angle.

As such, Lieskovszky does not disclose or suggest a reflector that is formed around a tubular light source and that is semi-circular or elliptical in shape. (Specification, p. 8, lines 15 – 20). Lieskovszky discloses a rotationally symmetric

reflector for a rotationally symmetric light source. The reflector has a forward section which may be parabolic in shape and a rear section which may be ellipsoid, parabolic, or spherical in shape. ('293, Col. 3, lines 25-29 & Figure 4). Furthermore, Lieskovsky does not disclose or suggest a reflective or a multi-faceted reflector surface (oriented stepwise and extending toward reflector aperture) to reflect light with a desired pattern. (Specification, p. 17, lines 8-11). Instead, Lieszkovszky discloses a smooth parabolic section and flutes that are aligned with the LA axis. ('293, Col. 3, lines 58-61).

Applicants therefore submit that the presently pending claims are distinguishable from Lieszkovsky.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claim 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Daumueller et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,975,723), in combination with Lieszkovszky et. al.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, a proposed combination of references must teach or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. M.P.E.P. § 2143. In light of the proposed amendments to independent claim 7, Lieszkovszky in combination with Daumueller does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention. As the proposed combination does not teach or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention, there can be no *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, Applicants submit that the pending claims are patentably distinct over the cited art.



Conclusion

Applicants have overcome each of the Examiner's rejections. Independent claims 1, 7, and 14 are allowable for the reasons stated above. The remaining pending claims are allowable because they are dependent on the allowable independent claims.

If, for any reason, the application is not considered to be in condition for allowance and an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (312) 913-0001.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF

By:



Thomas E. Wettermann

Date: 8/3/01

Reg. No. 41,523